

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/614,393		HARTMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Timothy D Collins		3643	

All Participants:

(1) Timothy D Collins.

(2) Mary Jo Bertani.

Date of Interview: 12 May 2005

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
Independent

Prior art documents discussed:
Super Sonic Aircraft

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: After Non-Final Rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: Approximately Noon

2's.c.m.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed that an examiner's amendment will be made that will clarify claim 1 to specify the invention of the decrease of the sonic boom shock loudness on the ground and the interaction of the nose and wing configuration that leads to this. The applicant's representative states the following: "

In response to telephone conversations with Examiner Timothy Collins on May 4, 5, and 10, 2005, Applicant submits this Supplemental Amendment to convert the apparatus claims 1-7 and 9-10 to method claims. The change was requested by Examiner Collins because although the subject matter of Claim 1 is thought to be allowable, it is more appropriately recited as a method instead of an apparatus. Corresponding amendments to claims 2-7 and 9-10, which depend from claim 1, have also been made.

The Examiner also requested Claim 1 to be amended to indicate an approximate minimum amount by which sonic boom disturbance would be reduced for the claimed configuration compared to aircraft without the claimed features. The amendment was not made to distinguish the claim from the prior art or any other reason related to patentability, but rather to quantify the effect of the claimed configuration. The amendment is supported by at least paragraph [0028] in the specification.

Claims 29-32 also depend from claim 1 but were previously withdrawn. Claims 29-32 should be allowable if Claim 1 is considered allowable. Accordingly, claims 29-32 have been amended to be consistent with claim 1.

Independent claim 33 and dependent claims 35 and 36 were also previously withdrawn. Applicant would like to capture the subject matter in claims 33, 35, and 36, and has thus converted claims 33, 35, and 36 to method claims that depend from claim 1. Claims 33, 35, and 36 should be allowable if claim 1 is considered allowable.

Figure 9E has been added at the request of Examiner Collins. Former Figures 9E and 9F have been renamed to Figures 9F and 9G, respectively. Figure 9E is supported by at least paragraph [0049] in the specification. Paragraph [0023.1] has been inserted after paragraph [0023] to include a brief description of new Figure 9E. Paragraphs [0049], [0050], and [0052] have been amended to include a reference to Figure 9E, and to renumber former Figures 9E and 9F. Copies of replacement drawing sheets 12 and 13 showing new Figure 9E are submitted herewith."